

Serial No.: 09/988,681
Docket No.: DP-827US
MAR.066

adjacent the transparent central section and positioned other than overlying the display, and the driving unit is connected to the colored section of the plate member, and thus is not overlying the display.

The final rejection contends that Hayes teaches an electronic device in which a transparent plate member extends over a display, and a driving unit is positioned other than over the display, and cites Hayes at page 2, lines 24-28 and at page 2 line 35 to page 3, line 1. This contention and the rejections based on it are traversed.

At page 2, lines 24-28, in conjunction with Figure 2, Hayes discloses a mobile telephone having a loudspeaker panel located directly over the display panel. The loudspeaker panel is made of a transparent material, such that the display can be seen through the loudspeaker. At page 2, line 35 to page 3, line 1, Hayes discloses that the transducers used for producing the acoustic panel are arranged so that the field of view is not obscured.

This does not teach that the transducers or driving unit is positioned other than over the display; instead, it teaches that the transducers or driving unit is positioned other than over the field of view. The field of view is only a part of the display. Thus, although teaching that the driving unit not be over the field of view, Hayes does not teach that the driving unit not be over the display.

Attached are the definitions of "field of view," "display," and "display area" from *IBM Dictionary of Computing*, George McDaniel editor, McGraw-Hill, Inc., 1994. The "field of view" is the extent of the area that is under view. In contrast, the "display" is a set of one or more screens that are driven by a single server. Thus, the "field of view" can not be equated with the display. If they were the same, the IBM dictionary would so indicate.

Serial No.: 09/988,681
Docket No.: DP-827US
MAR.066

The display area definition includes a Note reading: "Part of a display surface may not be available for presentation of images; for example, on cathode ray tube displays, part of the display surface, bordering the display area, is not scanned by the electron beam." The part of the display surface that is scanned by the electron beam is the area that is under view, and thus is the field of view. The remainder of the display surface, bordering the field of view, is nevertheless a part of the display. Thus, Hayes' teaching that the driving unit is not positioned over the field of view does not teach that the driving unit is not positioned over the display.

Neither Azima nor Porrazzo teaches a driving unit positioned other than over the display. It is accordingly submitted that the combination of Hayes, Azima, and Porrazzo does not provide a proper basis for rejecting the claims.

With respect to claim 15 and its dependent claims, the combination of Hayes, Azima, and Porrazzo fails to teach or suggest a plate member having a transparent central section overlying the display and a colored section adjacent the transparent central section and positioned other than overlying the display, in combination with a driving unit connecting to the colored section of the plate member for vibrating the plate member in response to an audio signal.

Specifically, at page 2, line 35 to page 3, line 1, Hayes discloses, *inter alia*, arranging the transducers used for producing the acoustics so that the field of view is not obscured. However, Hayes fails to teach or suggest any connection between the transducer and a colored section of the acoustic panel. The most Hayes teaches is a relation between the field of view and the transducer. That is, Hayes fails to teach or suggest a driving unit connecting to a colored section of a plate member for vibrating the plate member in response to an audio

Serial No.: 09/988,681
Docket No.: DP-827US
MAR.066

signal. Furthermore, neither Azima nor Porrazzo teaches a driving unit connecting to a colored section of a plate member for vibrating the plate member in response to an audio signal.

Thus, the combination of Hayes, Azima and Porrazzo fails to teach or suggest the invention as set forth in claim 15 and its dependent claims.


In view of the foregoing, Applicant submits that claims 1-23, all the claims presently pending in the application, are patentably distinct over the cited art and are allowable, and that the application is in condition for allowance. Such action would be appreciated.

Should the Examiner find the application to be other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney at the local telephone number listed below to discuss any other changes deemed necessary for allowance in a telephonic or personal interview.

To the extent necessary, Applicant petitions for an extension of time under 37 CFR §1.136. The Commissioner is authorized to charge any deficiency in fees, including extension of time fees, or to credit any overpayment in fees to Attorney's Deposit Account No. 50-0481.

Date: June 29, 2005

Respectfully Submitted,



James N. Dresser, Esq.
Registration No. 22,973

McGinn & Gibb, PLLC
8321 Old Courthouse Road, Suite 200
Vienna, VA 22182-3817
(703) 761-4100
Customer No. 21254

Serial No.: 09/988,681
Docket No.: DP-827US
MAR.066

CERTIFICATE OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that I am filing this Amendment Under 37 C.F.R. §1.116 by facsimile with the United States Patent and Trademark Office to Examiner Raymond S. Dean, Group Art Unit 2684 at fax number (703) 872-9306 this 29th day of June 2005.


James N. Dresser
Registration No. 22973

BEST AVAILABLE COPY